593 fourth time are they obliged to return what they have taken. The
685 son of a married daughter, who has not succeeded in being granted something from his grandfather, takes it without permission and does not give it up for /34/ the first three times. The fourth time the bii sentences him to return the thing without a penalty, but a penalty is fixed for a fight at the time the thing is taken. All this relates also to the close kinsmen in general.

When the thief denies his guilt, the bii interrogates witnesses, but he is not sworn among kin. Incidentally the bii consoles the father (or kinsman) by the fact that he takes from the son in his turn when the latter becomes rich (collected in the Perovsk uyezd).

593 Patricide is unknown in the steppe. For this crime they would
682 banish the offender from the society after a preliminary disgrace E. A. Aleksandrov, assistant to the chief of the Kazalinsk uyezd, says that the customary law is silent concerning patricide. The killing of children can happen by mistake, and in such a case it is not punished. (1)

[847] 1. It sometimes happens that the Kazakhs in a fit of anger and in general in matters of dispute, in showing their opposition throw their children under the /horse's ?/ legs of the adversaries, who not infrequently trample them in fighting. Women especially practise this kind of opposition, throwing unweaned children under the feet of horses. Wergeld
[628] in such cases is sought from the persons in the tent or in the village.

593 Children who have not received their allotment cannot have their own separate property. But once they have received their allotment the father ceases to distribute his property to them.

● [882] Until the age of 12-15, children are not yet of serious mind
[675] (akyl toktatpaidy), and therefore sales, purchases, loans and other arrangements by them are invalid. Buying and selling done against the will of the father by a son who has not yet received his allotment is not broken.

The power of the mother rests on the power of the father. Children obey her for fear that she will tell the father.

When a father wishes to free himself from an incorrigible son, he gives him a small allotment, leaving him to his own devices to earn the kalym /bride price/ if he is unmarried. If this son is already married, the father expels him without an allotment, leaving him to earn

may even place the authority in the hands of an adult son, if he has one, or a brother. Recourse to such action may be taken only rarely, but it is nevertheless a recognized delimitation of paternal powers. The parental authority over the son serves as the model for all authority patterns in Kazakh society, such as those involving the village elder, the clan leader, the beg, and the khan.[1]

In the past the parental authority was limited in another sense; the family was part of a village which camped and pastured its herds in common. The leaders of the village decided when and where to camp, when to change camp, when to break up the winter concentration of herds and families and move to the more dispersed spring and summer pastures.[2] A family head disobeyed these decisions at his risk. It was to his interest to follow them, since he gained many things thereby: fellowship, social position, protection from dangers by weight of numbers, assistance in time of need. The village in turn was subordinate to the clan authority if there was one. In case of raids, feuds, or other breaches of the peace, a village leader would appeal to the clan chief for aid. In a dispute between villages, a village elder would appeal to his clan chief for a judgment in his favor.

The village elder was the judge of his community, and decided all cases, usually with the support of the other senior men of the village. Appeals from their decisions were rare, defiance of their decisions even rarer. Behind the judgment of the village leader and the other elders lay the force of social solidarity, the weight of the entire village; defiance meant ejection and flight. Defiance of father by the son had similar consequences. The ultimate authority rested with the khan, if there was one, and if he cared to use his power, for he backed his authority with an army and the right of punishment by death or imprisonment, in addition to the force of his position.

The Kazakh household could include several wives if the position and wealth of the master allowed it. In one community studied, the Adai lineage on Mangyshlak peninsula, half the men had only one wife and half had two. In general, very few families contained more than two wives, although there is in theory no upper limit on the number of wives (exclusive of concubines) that a man can have. The ideal number of wives in princely families was considered to be five or nine—in contrast to the ideal number of wives for Moslems which the Koran gives as four. The family and marriage patterns of the Kazakhs are among the traits which give a pronouncedly non-Islamic coloring to their society.[3]

A youth was given his own tent and appurtenances when he came of age; traditionally he was soon to be married, and in fact a substantial number were married by the time they were 20 years old. Even as late as 1926, 222 out of every 1,000 males were married by that age, and in former years the rate was higher. The tent was not identical with the household unit. A young married couple with children did not

[1] Izvestnov, 1897, pp. 5, 11.
[2] Radloff (104), 1893, p. 513; Rudenko et al, 1930, pp. 4-8.
[3] Krutz (73), 1910, p. 42.